



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the Episode, Bugge is forced to acknowledge that "they seem to belong to *eotenas*, giants" (p. 37); but he denies the mythological origin of the Finnsaga and his reason is "eben weil mir die sage nicht mythisch scheint." It is to be regretted that he does not back his view with actual proofs; subjective impressions of course go for nothing. He does not state whether he also questions the relationship of the Finnsaga to the Hilde- and Gudrunasagas, although this point is of the greatest importance for the interpretation of both the Episode and the Fragment.

HUGO SCHILLING.

Wittenberg College.

A WORD OF EXPLANATION.

Prof. Brandt, NOTES ii. 132, has evidently misapprehended the animus of my passing remark, NOTES ii. 63.

On reading Bradley's *Academy* review of the *History of the German Language* (by Strong and Meyer), in Tübingen last summer, I deemed it somewhat of a joke that the editors should have made such a bad bungle as to mislead a scholar of Bradley's acuteness. And the joke seemed to repeat itself in Prof. Brandt's review of the same book. Why should so thoroughgoing a student of Old German as Prof. Brandt be at fault over the Germanic preterites, unless indeed he had been misled by the hap-hazard assertion of a couple of careless writers.

But now it appears that Prof. Brandt takes my allusion *au grand sérieux* and suspects me of twitting him with ignorance on a cardinal point of Germanic grammar. I am very sorry for this, and promise henceforth to be always serious.

It appears, furthermore, that my language was improper in calling *snera*, *sera*, *vera* "Noreen's reduplication-preterites." Does Prof. Brandt really believe that I look upon Noreen as the *Euldecker*, *Erfinder* *gar* of these preterites? My faulty style sprang from a desire to be concise. I trusted to the reader to expand my abbreviation into something like this: "The reduplication-preterites treated by Noreen in his Grammar, § 421."

The readers of NOTES will be grateful to me

for having—unintentionally—provoked Prof. Brandt to a fuller treatment of the reduplication-preterites than that previously given by him. We shall all profit by his scholarship. But at one point he must suffer me to put in an objection. He says: "I have heard of the Sigmatic aorist, but never of an *s*-perfect or *s*-preterite." But some of us have! If Prof. Brandt will only turn to Windisch, *Kurzgefasste Altirische Grammatik*, § 269, 274, he will find a special section devoted to forms like *gabim* 'capió,' *ro gabus* 'cepi,' and labeled "*s*-praeteritum." Then, § 303, the following statement: "In der späteren Sprache werden die alten Perfecta vielfach nach Analogie des *s*-praeteriti umgestaltet oder durch dasselbe ersetzt: *tanacus*, ich kam ... So auch *bebais* er starb für altirisch *bebe*, etc., etc." Again, § 338, Windisch treats of the *s*-preterite in deponent form, for example, *labrur* 'loquor,' *ro labrasur* 'locutus sum.'

My knowledge of Celtic is insufficient to warrant me in either attacking or defending Windisch's terminology. Possibly he may regard his *s*-preterite as a sigmatic aorist; I do not know. But is it surprising that Kuno Meyer, a pupil of Windisch, should speak of a perfect in *s*?

Prof. Brandt thinks that in criticising Noreen's § 76,3 and proposing its transfer to § 55, I did Noreen an injustice. Scarcely. I was chiefly concerned in clearing up a confusion of two phenomena alike in appearance but due to different causes. Noreen's statement tripped me, when I first met it, and I wished to prevent it from tripping others. I thought and still think that the proper place for treating *sokkenn* is that paragraph which speaks of the *u > o* by reason of an *-o* in the following syllable. If this change is found discussed anywhere else than § 55, I shall be pleased to learn it. Noreen could have mentioned *sokkenn* there as the specific Norse operation of a Germanic law, even if the chapter be labeled "Einleitendes über die Urgermanischen Sonanten." Perhaps it would have been still better, if Noreen had composed a separate section, to be entitled "Spuren urgermanischer Gesetze bei den Sonanten," making it the counterpart to his present chapter iv. p. 104, on such traces in the consonants.

In one or two respects my review of Noreen now appears to me questionable. It is not correct to say that *kolloðu* is a "carrying-back" of the *u*-umlaut. That is, the *u* in the ultimate. I now see, from §113. 1, that Noreen regards *kolloðu* < **kallōðn* < *kallōðu*. That is, the *kall-* is unlauded to *koll-* by the *u*(=ð) of the penult.

Will any one help to a better understanding of the imperative singular in Germanic? I cannot be quite certain from Sievers, §131, whether he accepts Paul's argumentation, *Beiträge* vi. 127, that *-e* must have survived in Germanic. His wording puzzles me. In §130 he says "Indog. (und noch germ.) *a*, *o* in ultima," in §131 "das ursprünglich auslautende *-e*." Is the "ursprünglich" in §131 the same as the "indog. (noch germ.)", of §130? If the *-e* was retained in Germanic, then the imperative singular of the verb 'to choose' in Icelandic may (must?) have been at one time **valeje*. Can we derive the actual *vel* from this through an unbroken chain of phonetic evolution, or has false analogy been at work? According to Sievers §45,8/ **valeje* should go over to **valje* (Gothic **nazejo* > *nazjo*). What was then the next step? Was the *-e* apocopated, **valj-* going over to **vali* > **veli* > **vele*? If so, we must account for *vel* by Noreen §135, and concede that Icelandic apocope is later than *i*-umlaut. Or was **valje* converted to **vale* by a general Germanic law that *j* after a short stem disappears before palatal vowels. Then we should get **vale*, (**val* §135), and not an unlauded *vel*.

I freely admit that I am at a loss, and hope that the point may be treated hereafter by Paul with his peculiar philosophic insight. His explanations, *Beiträge* VI, 161, 170, 173, are to me the least satisfactory portions of that memorable essay. They do not enable me to adjust Germanic umlaut (Paul's *-ij*, versus Sievers's *-ej*) and the conversion *s* > *z* > *r*. The rule of syncope *seems* to require the imperative singular to have stem-accent. If so, why do we get *nere*, instead of **nese*. Meanwhile I may ask the reader to add these remarks to my previous ones upon Noreen, §135 and §453.

J. M. HART.

University of Cincinnati.

OTHER NOTES ON THE *Andreas*.

From some of the *dicta* recorded by Bright in the last issue of 'Modern Language Notes' (Vol. II, 160—164), I am inclined to dissent. I shall endeavor, however, to give some reasons for disagreeing. *Faced* l. 301, *est* l. 483, *brim stæðo* l. 499, and *medum* l. 1377, I had given up before, *behlidenan* l. 1089, since the reception of Wülker's edition. For my views about l. 855 I refer to the forthcoming number of the 'American Journal of Philology.'

145. For MS. *wæs* Bright suggests *pæs*. The emendation *hwæs*, made by Thorpe and adopted by all the editors, I still adhere to. Initial *h* is several times missing in this poem, cf. *lyt* l. 6, *we is* l. 323 and here. Other letters are occasionally left out: *hetted* for *hettend* l. 31, *heorudeorize* for *heorudreorize* l. 996, etc. etc. Besides, I agree with Zupitza in considering *hwæs* interrogative, in thinking that we have here a dependent interrogative clause. Bright fails to explain how *pæs* is to be taken and to support his emendation with other like examples of *pæs* with this use.

64. But, if *pæs* were the correct reading, how would that help *seoðað* l. 64? As we see below, ð not þ is found in the Ms. Before we dismiss Baskervill's note so hastily, let us consider the note for his second edition of *Andreas*. MS. *seoðað* Gm. changed to *seowað* which was adopted by K. and Gr. Gr.² (*Germania* X) went back to the MS. reading. Gm. says, "*searonet seowað*=rete dolosum consunt . . . I have emended according to B. 8c6 (B. 406 it should read), although *seoðað*=coquunt might be used with reference to the forging of fetters. But the mistake of writing *p* for *v* in Anglo-Saxon is conceivable." Wülker answers this by saying that not *p*, but ð occurs here and adds, "but even with *seowað* little is gained; for in B. 406 *searonet* and *seowed* have an entirely different meaning='the (by the smith's craft) woven corselet.' The use of this verb with *searonet* in the sense suggested by Grimm does not occur. Grein derives *seoðað* from *seoðan*=coquere. In B. 190, 1993 this word is used in a different sense. On the other hand Gu. 1046, 1123, 1236 it signifies 'to vex, torture' (quälen) a meaning near akin to 'boil' (sieden). The passages in Beowulf signify 'to be excited over, brood, pine,' with *cearu* as